

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/807,383	03/24/2004	Steven T. Fink	071469-0308803	3335
909	7590 06/07/2006		EXAMINER	
PILLSBUR	Y WINTHROP SHAW I	PATEL, PARESH H		
P.O. BOX 1 MCLEAN,		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			2829	<u> </u>
			DATE MAILED: 06/07/2000	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/807,383	FINK, STEVEN T.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Paresh Patel	2829				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IDENTIFY THE MAIL	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be I will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fr te, cause the application to become ABANDO	ON. e timely filed rom the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 I	March 2006.					
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ Thi	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allows	ance except for formal matters,	prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-16</u> is/are pending in the application	n.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) 4-7 and 8-12 is/are	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>4-7 and 8-12</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	•					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3 and 13-16</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.	•				
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 24 March 2004 is/are:	a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objecte	d to by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	(a)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority documer	nts have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documer						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pri		eived in this National Stage				
application from the International Burea	, , , ,					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	at of the certified copies not rece	ived.				
•••						
Attachment(s)	4) Interview Summ	on (PTO 413)				
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing-Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mai	il Date				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:	al Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/807,383 Page 2

Art Unit: 2829

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 03/17/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that at no point Deutsch et al. describes that the door 12 and the door jamb or post 48 are electrically connected to one another because when door 12 is closed, the switch 56 is opened (no flow of current), therefore no flow of current from coil 20 to switch 56 through lever 24. Examiner respectfully disagrees because "flow of current" as argued is not found in the claim. The door 12 and the jamb or post 48 is electrically connected because disengagement of probe, signals separation of door 12 (first apparatus) and jamb or post 48 (second apparatus) as claimed.

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2829

3. Claims 1-2 and 13-16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Deutsch et al. (US 3309664).

Regarding claims 1, 13 and 15, Deutsch et al. (hereafter Deutsch) in fig 1-4 discloses an apparatus for monitoring the connection status of a connector, said apparatus comprising:

a first apparatus [12];

a second apparatus [48] configured to be electrically and mechanically coupled to said first apparatus;

a mounting device [36] located within said first apparatus; and

a probe [32,24, 26, 38, 18] configured to be mounted within said mounting device;

wherein said probe is electrically [via 40] coupled to said second apparatus [to 56] when said first apparatus and said second apparatus are coupled and when said first apparatus and said second apparatus are separated, said probe disengages from said second apparatus to signal disconnection between said first apparatus and said second apparatus.

Regarding claims 2, 14 and 16 Deutsch discloses a controller (a supply of energy for claim 14) [64, 66, 68, 70] coupled to said probe, said controller being configured to provide power to said first apparatus [via 21] and said second apparatus [via 60] and disconnect power between said first apparatus and said second apparatus when said probe disengages [when door opens] from said second apparatus to signal disconnection [via lamp 62] between said first apparatus and said second apparatus.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claim 3 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deutsch as applied to claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 3, Deutsch discloses all the elements but is silent about an insulator around said probe. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use insulation around the probe to protect the probe from external bias or corrosion. Since applicant has not disclosed that use of insulation solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with apparatus of Deutsch.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2829

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paresh Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-1968. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 to 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ha Nguyen can be reached on 571-272-1678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Paresh Patel Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2829